

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13, 18, 20-23 and 28-31 are independent claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 23-29 are allowed. In view of the remarks below, Applicants respectfully submit that all presently pending claims are allowable.

**35 U.S.C. 102(e) Gloe**

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication 2004/0083306 ("Gloe"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Gloe is directed to a method and apparatus for maintaining internet domain name data. The Examiner rejects claims 30 and 31 substantially based on Figure 7 of Gloe, and in particular paragraphs [0055]-[0057]. Figure 7 of Gloe describes a process of automatically generating an IP address at a host node.

In step 702 of Figure 7 of Gloe, a "link-local address" is generated. Gloe states that the link-local address construct "may have certain attributes such as lifetime associated with it" (See Paragraph [0055] of Gloe). The link-local address is formed by "combining a fixed-length pre-determined prefix ... with [a unique] interface address" (See Paragraph [0055] of Gloe). The generated link-local address is transmitted in step 703 as part of a Neighbor Solicitation message in order to test the uniqueness of the generated link-local address from 702 within a local network (See Paragraph [0056] of Gloe). If the link-local address is not unique, the conflicting node (i.e., the node having the same link-local address) notifies the host node (See Paragraph [0056] of Gloe).

If the link-local address is unique, the host node sends a Router Solicitation message in step 705 to request that any router respond with a Router Advertisement, and one or more routers respond with Router Advertisements in step 706. The Router Advertisement includes an IP address prefix of the router and address attribute information.

Independent claims 30 and 31 recite determining “an operating mode of a wireless terminal when a first message with prefix information was sent” and sending a message with updated prefix information “if the terminal was in a dormant mode when the first message was sent”. No such teaching is present within Gloe. With regard to these limitations, the Examiner states “a host node receiving an updated Router Advertisement when a Router Solicitation has been received meaning the node is in an active mode” (See Page 3 of the Office Action). However, this does not address actions taken upon a determination that a wireless terminal is in a dormant mode. From the perspective of the router, if the host node is dormant, no Router Solicitation would be received. Gloe does not address this scenario. From the perspective of the host node, if a router was dormant, no Router Advertisement would be received. Indeed, Gloe states “[t]he Router Solicitation is a request that any router on the local link send a Router Advertisement” (See Paragraph [0057] of Gloe). Thus, Gloe does not care whether a few routers are dormant so long as it gets a Router Advertisement message from an active router.

Further, as will be discussed below in greater detail with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection, Gloe teaches away from sending a Router Solicitation after a Router Advertisement has been received. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 30 and 31 are allowable over Gloe for at least this additional reason.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Gloe does not disclose or suggest determining “an operating mode of a wireless terminal when a first message with prefix information was sent” and sending a message with updated prefix information “if the

terminal was in a dormant mode when the first message was sent” as recited in independent claims 30 and 31.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Gloe in view of Takeda**

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gloe in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0105420 (“Takeda”). Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that “Gloe does not specifically disclose that the updated prefix information is solicited after a threshold time period that is shorter than the lifetime if a designated condition is met” (See Page 4 of the Office Action). The Examiner then cites to Takeda in order to show that a refresh request message can be sent if a binding lifetime is less than a threshold. Even assuming the Examiner is correct with regard to the teachings of Takeda (which Applicants do not admit), the claims cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious under the suggested combination.

The Examiner reads the “first message” upon the Router Advertisement of Gloe, and the “second message” upon the Router Solicitation of Gloe. The deficiency in the Examiner’s rationale is not just that Gloe does not disclose sending the Router Solicitation message more than a prefix lifetime after the Router Advertisement message (as admitted), but that the Router Solicitation would ever be sent after the Router Advertisement was received. The purpose of the Router Solicitation message is to solicit Router Advertisement(s). Once a Router Advertisement is received “from any router”, the purpose of the Solicitation/Advertisement exchange is

complete and the host node generates the global IP address in step 707 (See Paragraph [0057] of Gloc).

Further, in the more detailed discussion of Router Solicitations and Advertisements found later in Gloc, Gloc appears to discount the notion of re-sending Router Solicitations “[b]ecause routers generate Router Advertisements periodically [and] hosts will continually receive new advertisements” (See paragraph [0139] of Gloc). In other words, the routers are configured to periodically transmit Router Advertisements such that the host node need not re-solicit Router Advertisements via a Router Solicitation, especially after a Router Advertisement has already been received which is sufficient to perform step 707 of Figure 7.

In this sense, it is irrelevant whether Takeda discloses sending a particular message in the refresh request message “after a second time instant ... wherein the second time instant is a threshold time period from the first time instant” as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 18, 20 and 22 because, in the context of Gloc, Gloc does not disclose or suggest re-sending a Router Solicitation at all after Router Advertisement(s) are received (indeed, Gloc teaches away from this course of action). After all, what is the point of requesting something for a second time when it has already been received?

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Gloc in view of Takeda cannot disclose or suggest “a receive data processor operative to receive a first message with prefix information at a first time instant” and “a transmit data processor operative to send a second message to solicit updated prefix information after a second time instant ... wherein the second time instant is a threshold time period from the first time instant” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 13, 18, 20 and 22.

As such, claims 2-12, 14-17, 19 and 21, dependent upon independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 20, respectively, are likewise allowable over Gloc in view of Takeda at least for the reasons given above with respect to independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 20.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**Conclusion**

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-31 are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and early allowance are respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated December 4, 2007

:

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

By: /Kam T. Tam/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kam T. Tam  
Reg. No. 35,756  
(858) 651-5563